

Customer No.: 31561  
Docket No.: 10070-US-PA  
Application No.: 10/707,012

### REMARKS

#### Present Status of the Application

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 7, 13 and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato (US 2002/0140643) in view of Kunori (US 6,144,584). The Office Action rejected claims 2, 8 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato and Kunori and further in view of Lee (US 6,133,103). The Office Action rejected claims 3 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato and Kunori and further in view of Lai (US 6,875,645). The Office Action rejected claims 5 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato and Kunori in view of Zhang (US 6,219,118). In addition, claims 6 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 7 and 13 and cancelled claims 5-6 and 11-12 to more clearly define the present invention. Applicant has also newly added claims 18-19. After entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-3, 7-9, 13-16, 18-19 remain pending in the present application, and reconsideration of those claims is respectfully requested.

#### Rejection under 35 U.S.C 103 (a)

*The Office Action rejected claims 1, 7, 13 and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato (US 2002/0140643) in view of Kunori (US 6,144,584). In addition, claims 6 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.*

Customer No.: 31561  
Docket No.: 10070-US-PA  
Application No.: 10/707,012

Currently, Applicant has added the limitation of claims 6 and 12 "the conductive layer comprises at least a conductor formed over the branch lines" into dependent claims 1, 7 and 13. Applicant respectfully submits because the original claims 6 and 12 are allowable, the amended claims 1, 7, 13 with the limitation of claims 6, 12 should be allowed. For at least the same reasons, dependent claims 15-16 should also be allowed as a matter of law.

*The Office Action rejected claims 5 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato and Kunori in view of Zhang (US 6,219,118).*

Applicant has canceled claims 5 and 11 and rewritten claims 5 and 11 as new claims 18 and 19. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

The office action stated the limitation of the conductive layer comprises at least a conductor formed over the major source lines (originally recited in claims 5 and 11 and now described in claims 18 and 19) has been disclosed at col. 2, lines 26-28, col. 3, lines 1-54 and col. 6, lines 1-6, 37-41 of the Zhang reference (US 6,219,118). However, applicant respectfully disagrees. Zhang teaches "a light shielding conductive layer ....., said light shielding conductive layer disposed to cover said source lines and said gate lines and to leave exposed a portion of each of said pixel regions" at col. 6, lines 1-6, 37-41. As a matter of fact, the source lines disclosed by Zhang are also called data lines for inputting data signal to the pixels which are well known to the one skilled in the art, and Zhang also discloses source lines (data lines) and gate lines (scan lines) are arranged in a matrix form (see col. 3, lines 12-13), such that the source

Customer No.: 31561  
Docket No.: 10070-US-PA  
Application No.: 10/707,012

lines are not connected to a source (a power source) for providing required power to drive the light emitting diode. However, in claims 18 and 19 of the present application, the source line comprising a major source line and a plurality of branch lines is electrically connected with a source to supply the power to the light emitting diode of each pixel. Therefore, the source lines in the Zhang reference are different from that of the present application in function, manner and result. Applicant respectfully submits Zhang fails to teach the limitation of the conductive layer comprises at least a conductor formed over the major source lines (originally recited in claims 5 and 11 and now described in claims 18 and 19).

*The Office Action rejected claims 2, 8 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato and Kunori and further in view of Lee (US 6,133,103). The Office Action rejected claims 3 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato and Kunori and further in view of Lai (US 6,875,645).*

Applicant submits that, as disclosed above, Sato, Kunori and Zhang fail to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 1, 7 and 13 from which claims 2-3, 8-9 and 14 depend. Lai and Lee cannot cure the deficiencies of Sato, Kunori, Tomisawa and Zhang. Therefore, independent claims 1, 7 and 13 are patentable over Sato, Kunori, Zhang, Lee and Lai. For at the least the same reasons, their dependent claims 2-3, 8-9 and 14 are also patentable as a matter of law.

Customer No.: 31561  
Docket No.: 10070-US-PA  
Application No.: 10/707,012

**CONCLUSION**

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date :

Jan. 25, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee

Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor-1, No. 100  
Roosevelt Road, Section 2  
Taipei, 100  
Taiwan  
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800  
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233  
Email: [belinda@jicpgroup.com.tw](mailto:belinda@jicpgroup.com.tw)  
[Usa@jicpgroup.com.tw](mailto:Usa@jicpgroup.com.tw)